

**Remarks/Arguments:**

**Rejections under 35 USC §112, First Paragraph**

Claims 1-5 have been rejected under 35 USC §112, first paragraph for failing to comply with the enablement requirement. It is respectfully submitted that claims 1-5, as amended, are now in compliance with the enablement requirement.

**Rejections under 35 USC §102(b)**

Claims 1-13 and 15-20 have been rejected under 35 USC §102(b) as being anticipated by Hosomi et al. (US 5,833,380). It is respectfully submitted that claims 1-13 and 15-20, as amended, are patentable over Hosomi et al. for the reasons set forth below.

Hosomi et al. disclose a printer in Figures 1-5, which includes a scissor-type sheet cutting means utilizing two linear cutting blades (elements 9 and 14 in Figure 1). This scissor-type sheet cutting means is shown in greater detail in Figure 8.

The present invention, as recited in amended claim 1, contains a feature which is neither disclosed, nor suggested by the Hosomi et al., namely:

...a sheet cutting means disposed below said printing section,  
wherein said sheet cutting means comprises a linear cutting blade  
disposed on the opening end of said; and  
a circular cutting blade disposed on the main body portion opposing to  
said linear cutting blade. (Emphasis Added)

Independent claim 6, as amended, includes a similar feature. This feature, which is illustrated as elements 10 and 13 in Figures 5-8, is distinguished from the scissor-type sheet cutting means of Hosomi et al., which is formed of two linear cutting blades (elements 9 and 14 in Figure 1). The sheet cutting means of the present invention is shown, in Figure 5, as including a stationary linear blade 10 and a moveable circular blade 13. Hosomi et al. do not teach or suggest the use of a sheet cutting means comprising a linear cutting blade and a circular cutting blade as recited in claim 1, as amended.

The circular moving blade of the sheet cutting means of the present invention requires less space to operate than the linear moving blade of the scissor-type sheet cutting means disclosed by Hosomi et al. This allows for the sheet cutting means in the present invent to take up a reduced overall size.

Additionally, scissor-type cutting means, such as that disclosed by Hosomi et al. often suffer from the so-called "paper slipping problem" in which the sheet may slip between the blades and not be properly cut if there is a gap develops between a portion the linear cutting blades during operation. Hosomi et al. attempt solve this problem by bending the moving blade 9 as shown in Figure 7B. This solution causes grinding of the sharpened edges of the linear blades, which may lead to deterioration or damage to these blades. In the present invention both the "paper slipping problem and this grinding may avoided through use of the sheet cutting means recited in amended claims 1 and 6 by pressing noncutting surfaces of the linear and circular blades flush as shown in Figure 7.

Applicants note that, although not used as grounds of a rejection, in paragraph 7 of the Office Action the Examiner has cited Greene (US 5,690,774) as:

...teaching the obviousness of using different types of cutting mechanisms, such as rotary dies, guillotine, and scissors types, in sheet handling apparatuses...

The sheet cutting means of the present invention, as recited in amended independent claims 1 and 6, is not a rotary die, guillotine or a scissor type cutting means. Rather, the sheet cutting means recited in amended claims 1 and 6 is separate type of cutting means, which has advantages over these other cutting means.

Therefore, for the reasons set forth above, independent claims 1 and 6, as amended, are not subject to rejection under 35 USC §102(b) as being anticipated by Hosomi et al. As claims 2-5 and 16-20 depend from claim 1 and claims 7-15 depend from claim 6, these claims are not subject to this rejection as well.

Newly Added Claim 21

Newly added claim 21 adds no new matter. Support for this claim may be found in original claim 14. This new claim includes the features of original claim 14, which the Examiner has indicated in paragraph 6 of the Office Action would be allowable if written in independent form. Therefore, consideration and allowance of newly added claim 21 is requested.

**CONCLUSION**

Based on the foregoing amendment and remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1-20, as amended, and newly added claim 21 are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, reconsideration and allowance of all pending claims are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Lawrence E. Ashery, Reg. No.  
Lowell L. Carson, Reg. No. 48,548  
Attorneys for Applicants

LC/

Dated: October 14, 2003

P.O. Box 980  
Valley Forge, PA 19482  
(610) 407-0700

The Commissioner for Patents is hereby authorized to charge payment to Deposit Account No. 18-0350 of any fees associated with this communication.

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail, with sufficient postage, in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on:

October 14, 2003  
Danielle Murphy